REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsider the application as amended for allowance. The claims have been amended to more properly define their preexisting structural limitations in distinction from the cited reference noted below, as discussed with the Examiner during a teleconference of April 2, 2007.

As a preliminary matter, in the Final Office Action mailed December 28, 2006, the Examiner did not attach an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form references that were mailed to the PTO on March 11, 2002. As such, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that these references have been considered and made of record. The Examiner also did not indicate the references on said PTO-1449 form were not in conformance with MPEP 609.

Office Action Rejections Summary

Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 17, 19-24 and 27-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/16238 of Dierickx et al. ("Dierickx").

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 17, 19-24 and 27-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 17 have been amended to more properly define preexisting claim limitations. The amended claims are supported by the specification. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Claim 30 has been canceled, without prejudice.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/16238 of Dierickx et al. ("Dierickx"). It is submitted that claim 1

is patentable over the cited reference. It is submitted that the bottom line in Figure 3 of Dierickx is a part of the readout bus Y and is not connected to any of the amplifying elements A_1 through A_N other than by readout bus Y via the switch in Figure 3 of Dierickx. Moreover, the switch in Figure 3 of Dierickx is connected to switches X_1 through X_N and is not connected to the amplifying element, as purported by the Office Action.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "a second readout bus coupled to the second output switching element" and the "second output switching element coupled to the output terminal of the amplifying element without connection through the first switching element." Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference.

It is submitted that claims 2, 5-7 and 27-29 are patentable over the cited reference given that claims 2, 5-7 and 27-29 depend from and, therefore, include the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/16238 of Dierickx et al. ("Dierickx"). It is submitted that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference.

In regards to claim 8, the Office Action states, in part:

> Regarding claim 8, Dierickx et al. discloses . . . a first output switching element (X1) coupled to the output terminal of the amplifying element (A1); **a second output switching element coupled to the output terminal of the amplifying element (the second output switching element can be seen in Fig. 3);** a first readout bus (Y) coupled to the first output switching element (X1); a second readout bus coupled to the second output switching element (the second readout bus can be seen as the bottom line in Fig. 3, which is reference character "D" blown up); and an output amplifier coupled to the first and second readout buses (the output amplifier can be seen in Fig. 3 along with both the first and second readout buses), wherein the first and second readout buses are coupled to each of the array of amplifying circuits (as can be seen in Fig. 2).

(Office Action, 12/28/06, pages 4-5)(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion. If the second output switching element of claim 8 is being read onto the switch shown in Figure 3 of Dierickx, then such a reading would be inapposite based on the other limitations appearing in claim 8. In particular, claim 8 also includes the limitation that the second output switching element is coupled to the output terminal of the amplifying element. However, the switch shown in Figure 3 of Dierickx is not connected to the output of the amplifying element A1. Rather, the switch shown in Figure 3 of Dierickx is coupled to the switch X1. Therefore, an attempted reading of claim 8 onto the switch shown in Figure 3 of Dierickx does not satisfy all the structural coupling limitations appearing in claim 8. Furthermore, claim 8 has been amended to more precisely define it's preexisting structural limitations. Specifically, as amended claim 8 includes the limitations of "a second output switching element coupled to the output terminal of the amplifying element" and "a second readout bus coupled to the second output switching element **without connection through the first switching element**." (emphasis added). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference.

For reasons similar to those given above in regards to claim 1, it is submitted that claims 9-12 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 17 and 19-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WO 99/16238 of Dierickx et al. ("Dierickx"). It is submitted that claim 17 is patentable over the cited reference. Claim 17 includes the limitation of "transferring the amplified signal of the second memory element to a second readout bus in parallel with the transfer to the amplified signal of the first memory element to the first readout bus." In contrast, the serial switch arrangement of switch X and the switch of Figure 3 of Dierickx results in a sequential signal propagation.

It is submitted that claims 19-24 are patentable over the cited reference given that claims 19-24 depend from and, therefore, include the limitations of claim 17.

In conclusion, applicants respectfully submit that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Daniel Ovanezian at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 4/6, 2007

Daniel E. Ovanezian
Registration No. 41,236

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

on 4/6/07
Date of Deposit

JUANITA BRISCOE
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Signature

4/6/07
Date